



118 Lion Blvd PO Box 187 Springdale UT 84767 * 435-772-3434 fax 435-772-3952

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING ON
TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2016, AT 5:00PM AT THE SPRINGDALE TOWN HALL,
118 LION BLVD., SPRINGDALE, UTAH.**

The meeting convened at 5:03PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Jack Archer, Randy Taylor, Liz West, Scott Taylor, Mike Marriott and Jack Burns representing Zion National Park

EXCUSED: Allan Staker

ALSO PRESENT: DCD Tom Dansie, Associate Planner Toni Benevento and Town Clerk Darci Carlson recording. Please see attached list for citizens signed in.

Approval of Agenda: Motion made by Liz West to approve the agenda; seconded by Mike Marriott.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion and announcements: Ms. Benevento said the previous Night Sky event went. There were about twenty participants. The next event would be in August.

Ms. Carlson announced there would be a special Town Council meeting tomorrow night to open and amend the 2015/16 budget.

Action Items

Public Hearing – Design/Development Review: 67 unit lodging development at 668 Zion Park Boulevard (Canyon Ranch Motel): Mr. Dansie said this was a redevelopment proposal to build 67 hotel units in three buildings plus a lobby building. The property would retain a single family residence as an employee housing unit. The applicant sent additional information today which addressed code compliance issues raised in the staff report. Mr. Dansie provided a summary of the items in question and the corresponding revisions:

- Setback deficiency – applicant revised the site plan and adjusted location of buildings so required setback was met.
- Landscape plan quantity and types of plants – applicant verified the number of plants and indicated they were on the approved plant list. There were about 67-70 trees being preserved and about 50 more being planted. The type of grass had been changed to fescue. Pathways were not counted as part of the landscape area.
- Parking lot lighting – the revised submittal provided details and showed lighting was down directed and shielded.
- Grades and steep slope – applicant confirmed cuts into 30% grades were not natural grades. It was an old irrigation ditch that had been previously excavated.

Per the Commission's request, Mr. Dansie identified the specific zoning of the properties that border the proposed development.

Public questions: Chuck Passek asked if there would be pedestrian access from the Moenave Subdivision behind this proposed development through to SR-9. He indicated there was already a social trail here.

- Mr. Dansie said the Commission could discuss the issue however there was currently no contemplation of pedestrian walkways.

Greg Mathis from MRW Design was in attendance to answer Commission questions. Mr. Mathis said much effort had been put into the design to maintain the trees. He felt the development was within guidelines of what the Town was trying to achieve while also providing parking for visitors.

Commission questions: Mr. Mathis answered questions raised by the Commission:

- Non-glare roof material would be specified.
- Pedestrian pathways were something the owners may consider.
- Natural stone would be used on the buildings.
- Landscape screening was the preference however the developer was open to solid fencing where appropriate to help block lights from cars. The Commission wanted to ensure residents around the development were minimally affected.
- For parking lot lighting, the developer would use 3000k which was a warmer white.
- The swimming pool would be replaced but remain in the same location.
- The owner wanted to find a way to save the historic house on the front of the lot. It contained some of the original wood brought down from Cable Mountain.
- The property was designed to keep as many of the existing trees as possible. It was the developer's intention to preserve the shade trees in front.
- Encroachment into 30% slopes would not affect natural grade but would push back the old irrigation ditch to accommodate additional parking.
- In order to get the square footage bonus the developer increased the setback from residential homes to 100', used natural rock, and would provide a house for employee housing.
- Open space was 33,000 square feet. The rest of landscape was about 55,000 square feet. Combined it represented about 51.4% of the lot. Buildings, parking lots and hardscape represented about 48.6% of the lot.
- There would be a down directed egress light at the doors and recessed lighting at the porticos and balconies.

Public questions to the applicant: Lisa Zumpft appreciated the developer's efforts to save the trees. She suggested they confirm the trees were not diseased and needed to be removed. Mr. Mathis believed they were healthy.

- Kevin Ence, one of the developers, acknowledged that one or more of the trees may have issues from past trimming. He committed to have a professional look at the trees in advance.

Mark Hare, from Canyon Ranch, asked if there was a way for fire trucks to come in and turn around on the property. Mr. Mathis said the property was designed per fire code. Mr. Hare also asked about the visual screening to mitigate adverse effects.

James Marvin, owner of 700 Elm Street, asked about the terminus of Elm Street. Mr. Dansie said Elm Street was a private access easement that served two or three residences. Mr. Mathis said Elm Street would not be used at all and would terminate as it currently did. There would be screening between the parking lot and the residential units.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to open public hearing; seconded by Liz West.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments: Lisa Zumpft thanked the designer for their consideration of the community. She asked the Commission to include provisions in the motion about care of the trees and landscape

screening. She also indicated the American Medical Association published information indicating LED temperatures higher than 3000k may be detrimental to health and asked that lights were this rating or lower. Ms. Zumpft wanted to be sure the project was produced as the developer presented and suggested Commissioners could table the issue until they were comfortable with all the information.

Chuck Passek wanted to reiterate that a pedestrian trail was important so people had access through the property to SR-9. There was an existing social trail which he hoped would remain and not be fenced off.

- Kevin Ence said they wanted to be good neighbors and the concept made sense however they would have to work on the design.
- Mr. Dansie said there were trails designed in the Moenave Subdivision plan but none that connected to the back of Canyon Ranch. Central Commercial design guidelines talked about making provisions for pedestrian convenience but nothing was required.

Joseph Baumhauer said if access had been granted for many years, a legal right-of-way may exist. He suggested the topic be addressed with an attorney.

Motion made by Mike Marriott to close public hearing; seconded by Jack Archer.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Commission discussion: Ms. West said the developer could not be forced to create a right-of-way. She suggested the Town look into creation of a cooperative public easement so responsibility for a pedestrian trail was shared.

Mr. S. Taylor said it was important to save the trees. He agreed the developer should contract with an arborist.

- Mr. R. Taylor said it was appropriate the trees be protected during construction.
- Mr. Marriott asked how far they would have to excavate down for the roadway base given the soils report. Mr. Mathis said it varied from 30" to 12".

Mr. Burns said balcony lighting could be a potential impact on adjacent land owners. The placement of the light was important to people on a lower level.

Mr. Marriott said the development appeared to conform with the underlying ordinance requirements as long as the identified corrections were made. Regarding the tree issue, Mr. Marriott questioned what was reasonable to ask of the developer.

- Mr. R. Taylor said all the healthy trees should be preserved. Any adjustments should be made to the placement of the buildings or curb and gutter and not the trees.
- Kevin Ence said they felt as strongly about the trees as the community. He was committed to working with an arborist throughout the whole project. They wanted to maintain the aesthetics of the big, beautiful trees.

Mr. Dansie said the Commission had the option to approve the project tonight with conditions in outline form. This would allow time to craft specific language to ensure the motion was not ambiguous. The motion could then be ratified in the next meeting. Staff would help fine tune the language and provide to Commissioners for review.

Motion made by Liz West to approve the Design/Development Review for the hotel redevelopment at 668 Zion Park Boulevard, Canyon Ranch, based on findings: the standards in chapters 10-11A Central Commercial Zone and 10-16 Architectural Standards and Design Guidelines are met including building height, landscape, illumination, colors and materials, unit count, parking, screening, and grading; revised building A meets the 100' setback, revised building B meets the 20' setback, and revised building C meets the 20' setback. With conditions 1) the parking lot lights and all lights be 3000k or less, warm lighting; 2) revised bollard lights be used; 3) all the grass be fescue; 4) the current trees be protected during construction and an arborist examine the

trees to determine which are healthy and be present during construction; 5) there be screening around adjacent residences to protect against parking lot lighting and the developer consult with the neighbors along the property lines regarding the preferred height of fencing at either 6' or 8' tall; 6) non-reflective metal roof materials be used; 7) recommend Moenave and Canyon Ranch discuss a possible agreement for a walking pathway; 8) all balcony lighting be shielded downward. The motion language will be worked on by Town staff and during the next Planning Commission meeting it will be ratified with more detail; seconded by Scott Taylor.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Design/Development Review: Single Family Residence at Anasazi Plateau, Lot 10: Ms. Benevento said applicants Holly and Adam Hyatt were in attendance. Staff outlined their concerns including: courtyard grading disturbance that was greater than 20'; driveway contour lines and elevations that were not clear as well as the amount of fill that would be used; the rear retaining wall was greater than 4' in height therefore engineered plans needed to be submitted with the construction set; lighting fixtures were not completely cut-off and needed to be shielded along the top and not use bulbs over 60w; and the conservation easement must be protected by fencing.

Ms. Benevento indicated the applicants had submitted additional information earlier in the day to address these concerns which was sent to the Commissioners.

Mr. Hyatt brought building materials for review. Mr. Archer asked the applicant to provide these samples to staff for them to confirm compliance.

Commissioners questioned the applicants regarding the issues raised in the staff report.

- Mr. Archer questioned the driveway. Mr. Hyatt said it would have to be engineered and indicated they wanted to get through the Design/Development Review process first and then engage an engineer. The driveway surface would be all concrete.
- Mr. Archer reiterated the need to protect the conservation easement with plastic fencing. Mr. Hyatt understood this requirement.
- Mr. R. Taylor noted the development crossed a lot of 30% slopes and asked if this was inherent of the subdivision. Mr. Dansie said the area near the roadway was fill and not a natural slope therefore it could be disturbed. There were other areas scattered throughout the site which qualified under code section 10-15B-9(a)(2) allowing disturbance in this instance.
- Mr. Archer asked about the number of retaining walls. Mr. Hyatt said there would be one along the back. The front would be determined later once the building pad was leveled and another soils test done. Mr. Hyatt did not believe there was blue clay on the lot.
- Mr. R. Taylor noted the culvert should be more in line with the flow with the natural gully. Mr. Hyatt said it would be adjusted to where the water would flow and likely be about 18" wide. The mouth of the culvert would need to be kept clean.
- Ms. West questioned excessive lighting. Ms. Benevento said the applicant reduced the number of lights in the areas of concern.
- Ms. West asked about the amount of windows and trespass of light. The applicant said they intended to install blinds. Mr. Hyatt said they planned to plant trees on the northwest slope to protect neighbors. There was a roof on the upstairs patio so the area could be used during the winter. Lighting would be recessed or down lit. If a fire pit was built it would need a chimney.

Mr. R. Taylor said this was a very challenging lot to build on. Mr. Archer agreed. Proper engineering would be necessary. The supplemental reports provided by the applicants seemed to address areas in question.

Motion made by Randy Taylor to approve the Design/Development Review for Anasazi Plateau Lot 10 based on findings it meets ordinance standards on setbacks in the Foothill Residential zone, building size, and building heights; lighting doesn't meet full cut-off but because of exception for low-wattage bulbs the lighting as proposed is approved; the grading plan has been revised to

meet the requirements of the ordinances; one of the retaining walls will be higher than 4' and will require an engineered design before the building permit is approved; landscaping meets the requirements and colors and materials meet the Town code; the conservation easement must be fenced with the orange construction fence; and the culvert under the driveway be moved to fit the flow line of the drainage; seconded by Liz West.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Design/Development Review: Single Family Residence at Canyon Springs, Lot 39: Ms. Benevento said Shawna Sprague was in attendance to represent home owners Pam and Don Toulouse. The lot area, setbacks, building size and height, lighting, and landscape met standards. However, there were significant slopes of 30% or greater in the rear of the property that needed to be disturbed for the finished floor elevation. Per staff recommendation, the applicant submitted revised plans which included a retaining wall therefore the cut into the slope should not be as great. If the retaining wall was greater than 4' it would have to be engineered and submitted with the construction set. Staff indicated the stucco color needed to be approved.

Mr. Dansie said there was a site-specific soils report done on the lot. Mr. R. Taylor asked what was found.

- Ms. Sprague said soils were tested in two spots where the home would be built. There did not seem to be any problems with the lot other than leveling it.
- Mr. R. Taylor said the back hillside was clay therefore he was concerned about the foundation. Mr. Dansie said the geotechnical test log indicated there was clay in the soil. The report recommended over-excavation of 5' below the footings or existing grade for foundation preparation.

Mr. S. Taylor asked if the owners were comfortable living by a landslide area with blue clay. Ms. Sprague said they were accustomed to this type of thing and not worried about the watershed. She indicated an engineer had looked at the lot and conducted a 100-year flood study. They planned to make landscape adjustments to get water to the culvert on the property.

Mr. R. Taylor asked if the cottonwood tree would be saved. Ms. Sprague said 'yes'. The house was positioned by it.

Mr. Marriott questioned the landscaping. Ms. Sprague said the owners liked natural landscaping and did not want to disturb a lot of the area. They intended to put in six trees on the left side of the house with natural habitat in the front.

Mr. Archer asked about the new cut on the slope. Ms. Sprague said it would be less than ten (10) feet.

Mr. Archer asked if there were issues with drainage on the property. Ms. Sprague said water would have to be diverted to a designed brook which would follow the natural landscape to the culvert. Ms. Sprague said the engineer did not feel there would be any more than a foot of water in this brook at any given time. The engineered brook would be on the backside of the retaining wall and go past the driveway. More engineering would be done if the home design was approved. Underground drainage could be considered.

Lisa Zumpft, from the Canyon Springs Home Owners Association, asked about the location of the culvert and if the home owner was comfortable it would be big enough. Ms. Sprague said the culvert was on the left side of the Murdock residence. The engineer was looking at the culvert size.

Regarding the rear wall, Ms. Sprague said the goal was to stay under 9' in height. She thought this may be accomplished by shifting the position of the rear covered patio slightly. Setbacks would not be impacted.

Mr. Marriott said Canyon Springs had building pods. Ms. Sprague confirmed the home was within the lot building pod.

Mr. R. Taylor asked if the Commission could approve the DDR tonight and then have all the engineering issues addressed during the building permit stage.

- Mr. Dansie indicated it could. If there were any concerns the engineering might impact the design, the Commission could ask the applicant to provide a redesign.

Ms. West confirmed the applicant had not completed an engineered design yet. Ms. Sprague said their biggest concern was the watershed. The engineer initially focused on this. Ms. Sprague did not think the retaining walls were as much of an issue.

Mr. R. Taylor was concerned with underground drainage. He felt it would be safer if drainage was open.

- Mr. Marriott said they should be cautious with their drainage plan. Ms. Sprague agreed.

Ms. Zumpft asked if the cottonwood tree would continue to be watered.

- Mr. Burns said a cottonwood tree of that size has deep roots so surface water was a waste.

Mr. Archer said the overall project was in compliance but he was concerned with the back corner grade. If engineering determined the wall needed to be over 10' then the applicant would need to come back.

- Ms. West said design elements met standards but the project needed more engineering help. If approved tonight the applicant could continue with the engineering. If any changes were made they could come back to the Commission.

Mr. Marriott did not think the project had been approved by the HOA. Ms. Sprague said all the paperwork had been submitted to the HOA.

Given the landslide above it, Mr. S. Taylor did not think anything should be built on the lot. If the owners were willing to take the risk then he believed the design was in compliance. Ms. Sprague said the owners thought long and hard about it and decided to move ahead.

Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the Design/Development Review for Lot 39, Canyon Springs, based on findings the building height, setbacks, and building size are all in compliance with the ordinances. Conditions of approval include: 1) colors and materials need to be shown to staff; 2) drainage and grading design plans need to be engineered and submitted to staff prior to a building permit being granted; 3) if there are any other retaining walls over 4' they need to be engineered; 4) four trees need to be replaced for the one being taken out; 5) if the engineered plans show that the house needs to be moved the applicant needs to return to the Planning Commission for additional review; seconded by Liz West.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Consent agenda: Ms. Carlson noted a correction. The name Mr. R. Taylor was corrected to be Mr. S. Taylor on page three.

Motion made by Jack Archer to approve the minutes from June 7th; seconded by Mike Marriott.

R. Taylor: Aye

Archer: Aye

West: Aye

S. Taylor: Aye

Marriott: Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 7:16pm made by Mike Marriott; seconded by Liz West.

R. Taylor: Aye
Archer: Aye
West: Aye
S. Taylor: Aye
Marriott: Aye
Motion passed unanimously.

Darci Carlson
Darci Carlson, Town Clerk

APPROVAL: _____

[Signature]

DATE: _____

7-5-16



TOWN OF SPRINGDALE

PO Box 187 118 Lion Blvd Springdale UT 84767

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Please sign

Meeting of Planning Commission on 6/21/16
If you'd like to be included on our great e-notice list, please give us your email address. That's the only reason you need to provide that information. Your address will never be sold, though we may have to provide it as public information. If you have provided the information before, you don't need to add it again.

name <u>Lila Moss</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Lisa Zapp</u>	email (not required)
name <u>HANS DUNKLINGER</u>	email (not required)
name <u>MARC HARB</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Shawna Sprague</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Adam Hyatt & Holly Holt</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Greg Mathis</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Tommy Mowen</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Joseph Bauhauer</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Michelle & Terry Kruschke</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Don Hall</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Kevin Eme</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Nick Eme</u>	email (not required)
name <u>Matt Rayner</u>	email (not required)
name _____	email (not required)
name _____	email (not required)
name _____	email (not required)
name _____	email (not required)
name _____	email (not required)